

**PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant  
Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001**

**Award Number:** DTPH56-09-G-PHPSO2 *[From Section 1.03 of your agreement]*  
CFDA Number: 20.720

**Project Title:** UNCC State Damage Prevention Grant *[From Section 1.03 of your agreement]*  
A program to help Colorado establish collaborative stakeholder efforts, implement more effective stakeholder communications, and target appropriate 811 awareness, education and training programs.

**Date Submitted:** March 31, 2010 *[Date of report submission]*  
**Submitted by:** JD Maniscalco *[Who is submitting]*

**Specific Objective(s) of the Agreement**

*[Cut and paste from Section 2.03 of your agreement.]*

1. Create an administrative foundation for future compliance enforcement of state One-Call laws.
2. Develop a method of identifying and documenting damage prevention programs and activities around the state for use with the Damage Data Report, the Damage Prevention Report Card, and the Damage Prevention Portal.
3. Continue to promote the nine elements and support the Damage Prevention Action Team and Damage Prevention Councils.
4. Continue to support the Damage Prevention Action Team in its leadership role.
5. Support Damage Prevention Awareness Month in April 2009 with a statewide public awareness campaign.
6. Distribute Damage Data Report and Damage Prevention Report Card and encourage active participation of local community governance and regulatory agencies, including County Commissioners, City/Town Mayors, Public Works Directors, Permit Office Managers, the PUC, PHMSA, and OSHA.
7. Increase the number and involvement of Damage Prevention Councils in the state.
8. Provide some financial support for every Damage Prevention Council in the state.
9. Continue development of the Colorado Damage Prevention Portal to collect and provide additional damage prevention information to stakeholders.

**Workscope**

*[Cut and paste from Article III. Workscope of your agreement.]*

- A. *Element 2*): A process for fostering and ensuring the support and partnership of stakeholders in all phases of the program.
- B. *Element 5*): A process for fostering and ensuring active participation by all stakeholders in public education for damage prevention activities.
- C. *Element 7*): Enforcement of State damage prevention laws and regulations for all aspects of the damage prevention process, including public education, and the use of civil penalties for violations assessable by the appropriate State authority.
- D. *Element 8*): A process for fostering and promoting the use, by all appropriate stakeholders, of improving technologies that may enhance communications, underground pipeline locating capability, and gathering and analyzing information about the accuracy and effectiveness of locating programs.

# PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant

## Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001

Accomplishments for this period (Item 1 under Section 9.01 Progress Report: “A comparison of actual accomplishments to the objectives established for the period.”)

*[How are you progressing on each of the items/elements provided in the “Specific Objectives” and “Workscope”? Start with an overall description followed by item-by-item or element-by-element detail if possible.]*

### GLOSSARY OF TERMS:

<b>PHMSA</b>	<b>Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration</b> – an agency of the federal government that deals with regulatory oversight of the pipeline industry.
<b>EDPI</b>	<b>Excavation Damage Prevention Initiatives</b> – a formal industry effort developed by a group of industry associations and stakeholders in 2006/2007 that identified and defined nine initiatives to support a successful damage prevention program.
<b>UNCC</b>	<b>Utility Notification Center of Colorado</b> – the Colorado One-Call Center.
<b>DPC</b>	<b>Damage Prevention Council</b> – a formal group of local stakeholders from one or more counties interested in discussing damage prevention issues, promoting public awareness, and developing and presenting stakeholder educational programs.
<b>DPAT</b>	<b>Damage Prevention Action Team</b> – a formal group of dedicated individuals from the DPCs formed in 2007. These individuals are interested in discussing relevant damage prevention issues, directing and coordinating public awareness and damage prevention activities around the state and sharing the success of public awareness and damage prevention programs.
<b>PUC</b>	<b>Public Utilities Commission</b> – an agency of the state government that deals with regulatory oversight of the utility industry.
<b>CGA</b>	<b>Common Ground Alliance</b> – a member-driven industry association dedicated to ensuring public safety, environmental protection, and the integrity of underground facility and services.
<b>DIRT</b>	<b>Damage Information Reporting System</b> – the web based damage information reporting system developed by UNCC and not owned and utilized by CGA.
<b>DP</b>	<b>Damage Prevention</b> – an abbreviation used for reference to damage prevention activity.

### Overview

Much of the progress describing the 2009 PHMSA Grant objectives was covered in the 2009 Mid Term Report submitted in August, 2009. That report also reviewed the 2008 damage data and provided an analysis of the Quantifiable Metrics of Effectiveness with regard to the continued reduction in damage level per incoming ticket level and the quantifiable cost to reduce damages in 2008. Please see the 2009 Mid Term Report for the detail.

Since the CGA DIRT system requires that industry stakeholders submit facility damage reports by March 31 each year, we did not have access to the reports by the time this report was due. As a result, we do not have any additional information to report on 2008 damages or new information on the 2009 damages. So as not to repeat the 2008 information already provided and to keep this report at a reasonable length, we will provide an update to the 2009 damage data and the Quantifiable Metrics in the 2010 Mid Term Report. The 2009 Final Report will serve to identify and explain the additional damage prevention activities undertaken and grant funds expended through the end of year 2009.

## **PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001**

### **Objective-1) Administrative Foundation for State Compliance**

Progress on the state compliance objective has progressed as expected. The Denver Metro DPC obtained stakeholder approval on the compliance letters and stakeholder contact process and began a pilot program in December 2009 to receive non-compliant reports from stakeholders and send out the compliance package (described in the 2009 Mid Term Report). We have no measures to report at this time, but will provide an update in the 2010 Mid Term Report.

The Grant Facilitator is currently working with members of the Denver Metro DPC, the DPAT, and Table Mountain Partners (the DP Portal developer) to implement the compliance letter, contact process, and tracking in the DP Portal. Once the implementation is complete in 2010, the compliance process will be rolled out to all DPCs.

To reiterate from the 2009 Mid Term Report, determining fault and assessing civil penalties is not a component of the compliance process at this time as the DPCs do not have the legal authority to assess and recover civil penalties.

**Work Scope:** This objective supports Work Scope Elements 2 and 7.

**Future Activity:** Implement the DP Compliance process in the DP Portal and roll out compliance process to all DPCs in 2010.  
UNCC will provide the administrative support for mailings and pay for postage and educational materials.  
Members of DPAT may develop a stakeholder educational program in the future to work in conjunction with the compliance process.

**Expected Completion:** Objective met and complete in December, 2009.

### **Objective-2) Document Damage Prevention Activities**

Members of the DPAT and DPCs have agreed to begin reporting DP Activities for tracking on the DP Portal and for use as a grading section on the DP Report Card. DP Activity reporting elements have been identified and defined. The Grant Facilitator, members of DPAT and Table Mountain Partners will implement the DP Activity scheduling, tracking and reporting process in the DP Portal during the spring and summer of 2010.

**Work Scope:** This objective supports Work Scope Elements 2, 5 and 8.

**Future Activity:** Implement the DP Activity scheduling, tracking and reporting process on the DP Portal and roll out process to all DPCs in 2010.  
Integrate DP Activity as a grading section on the DP Report Card in 2011.

**Expected Completion:** Objective met and complete in December, 2009.

**PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant  
Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001**

**Objectives-3 & 4) Support of EDPI, DPCs and DPAT**

The Grant Facilitator and UNCC Public Relations Administrator have met each month with DPCs around the state to promote and discuss the EDPI 9 Initiatives, PHMSA grant objectives, grant project funding, and public awareness and damage prevention activities supported by the grant. We also facilitated the DPAT Spring meeting (Colo Springs, March 20, 2009) and the DPAT Fall meeting (Grand Junction, October 22-23, 2009) to discuss and review progress of the damage prevention objectives, review and discuss individual county damage prevention activities, review and approve grant expenditures, and establish future direction. Stakeholder participation in the DPAT Fall meeting involved leadership from 11 DPCs comprised of 60 individuals representing facility owners, locators, excavators, one-call staff and the PUC.

Table-2 summarizes the costs associated with supporting the DPAT.

**Table-2**

<b>DPAT Item</b>	<b>Expense For DPAT Support</b>	<b>Grant Funds</b>
DPAT	DPAT Spring Meeting - hotel rooms for 3 DPC members from Mesa County	\$ 328.17
DPAT	Meeting room in Grand Junction – DPAT Fall Meeting	\$ 560.00
DPAT	Stakeholder Awards – DPAT Fall Meeting	\$ 875.15
DPAT	1000 811 Decals – Government agency awareness mailings (Objective 6)	\$ 236.68
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 2,000.00</b>

**Work Scope:** This objective supports Work Scope Elements 2 and 5.

**Future Activity:** Continue meeting with DPCs in 2010 and facilitate operation of the DPAT. Write 2009 Final Report in March 2010.

**Expected Completion:** Objective will be complete March, 2010 with the Final Report

# PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001

## Objective-5) Support Damage Prevention Awareness Month in April 2009

This objective was Complete in May 2009. As a follow up, the Grant Facilitator and UNCC Public Relations Administrator arranged for radio advertisement spots (\$4,030) and Cable TV advertisement spots (\$4,550) around the state in September. The DPCs combined part of their individual grant funding to sponsor these spots. The DPCs sponsored additional promotional activities (\$ 6,092.81) in the fall. Note that the \$ 6,514.75 for Comcast was paid in the fall but actually sponsored 811 awareness Cable TV spots during April DP Awareness month.

Unfortunately, the DPCs are not able to reasonably track the level of participation in these types of awareness and local community events. Certainly, tens-of-thousands of the public are exposed to these events around the state, if not more. The eventual impact can be measured in changes in the level of locate requests over time (normalized for population, population growth, and construction activity levels) and the general awareness of the community. Our goal is to increase the DP awareness activity level performed by the DPCs, which should translate into a higher level of awareness, more stakeholder compliance and fewer facility damages. We anticipate that the DPCs will attempt to estimate the level of stakeholder/public participation in these events when they report their activities in the DP Activity tracking module.

Eleven DPCs undertook special 811 Awareness programs in their communities for *Damage Prevention Awareness Month* in April 2009 as well as in the fall 2009.

Table-2 briefly summarizes these activities and their associated costs.

**Table-2**

DPC/DPAT	Damage Prevention Awareness Activity Spring 2009 (DP Awareness Month-April) and Fall 2009	Grant Funds April 2009	Grant Funds Fall 2009
DPAT sponsored statewide	April Comcast Cable TV commercials around state, web presence	\$ 13,485.25	\$ 6,514.75
Facility owner sponsored statewide	April Suncor gas pump placards in Denver Metro area (paid by facility owner stakeholder at 40 gas stations)	\$ 0.00	
Denver Metro	community parade in Adams County, 811 promo items	\$ 1,358.03	
Denver Metro	811 decals		\$ 1,382.10
Weld	town banner, yard signs around city	\$ 1,000.00	
Weld	811 frisbees for community parade		\$ 1,019.07
El Paso	town banner, yard signs around city, convenience store signs	\$ 371.77	
Las Animas	2 proclamations, yard signs around city, tool rental store signs, radio PSA, newspaper PSA, community events (paid by facility owner stakeholder)	\$ 0.00	
Mesa	yard signs around city, tool rental store booths and signs, radio PSA, newspaper PSA, Cable TV PSA (continuing through year)	\$ 1,540.40.	
Mesa	811 presentation T-shirts, rent booth for community event		\$ 240.00
Four Corners	county fair booth in three counties (paid by stakeholder)	\$ 0.00	
Four Corners	811 tote bags for community events		\$ 500.00
Western Slope	Cable TV and radio PSA in five counties, community events	\$ 1056.99.	
All DPCs	DPC 811 presentation shirts, DPC 811 stakeholder ballcap (promo)		\$ 2,951.64
All DPCs	Radio – 811 advertising spots - statewide		\$ 4,030.00
AI DPCs	Cable TV – 811 advertising spots - statewide		\$ 4,550.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>= \$ 40,000.00</b>	<b>\$ 18,812.44</b>	<b>\$ 21,187.56</b>

**PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant  
Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001**

- Work Scope:** This objective supports Work Scope Elements 2 and 5.
- Future Activity:** Future activity will depend upon grant and stakeholder funding in 2010. Many stakeholders undertake 811 awareness and promotion activity as well as stakeholder education activity with internal company funding. These include large utility distribution companies, municipal agencies, pipeline companies, locator companies, and industry associations.
- Expected Completion:** Objective met and complete in May, 2009  
Additional activity complete in December 2009

**Objective-6) Distribute Damage Data Report and Damage Prevention Report Card to Community Leaders**

A damage prevention information package was prepared and mailed to community leaders (County Commissioners) in each county. The damage prevention information package was described in the 2009 Mid Term Report. This informational mailing coincided with Damage Prevention Awareness Month in April 2009. Unfortunately, the community leaders provided no feedback and demonstrated no interest in assisting with damage prevention in Colorado.

- Work Scope:** This objective supports Work Scope Elements 2, 5 and 7.
- Future Activity:** No future activity anticipated.
- Expected Completion:** Objective met and complete in May, 2009

## **PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001**

### **Objectives-7 & 8) Establish two additional DPCs in state and provide financial support through PHMSA Grant funding.**

*(partially restated from 2009 Mid Term Report)*

Colorado started 2009 with 7 DPCs and 2 Joint Utility Coordinating Committees (Cities of Aurora and Pueblo).

Of these 7 DPCs:

- 2 are CGA regional partners (Denver Metro and El Paso County)
- 4 include stakeholders that represent facility owners and excavators within a single county  
(Weld County, El Paso County, Las Animas County and Mesa County)
- 3 represent stakeholders within multiple counties  
(Denver Metro-6 counties, Four Corners-3, and Western Slope-6)
- Both Four Corners and Western Slope represent primarily oil and gas pipeline stakeholders in the western 1/3 of Colorado.
- All but 2 of the 7 DPCs (El Paso County and Mesa County) are funded by the members-stakeholders.

In the spring of 2009, the UNCC Public Relations Administrator worked closely with interested stakeholders and helped establish 4 additional DPCs in Colorado. These include:

- 1) Larimer County DPC
- 2) Fremont County DPC
- 3) PEG DPC (Pitkin, Eagle and Garfield Counties)
- 4) Northwest Area DPC (Rio Blanco, Moffat and Routt Counties)

Our goal in 2009 was to establish 2 additional DPCs - so we exceeded this objective with 4 new DPCs.

The 2009 PHMSA Grant provided \$40,000 for 811 Awareness and stakeholder education.

Half of this amount was available during the spring of 2009 to support *Damage Prevention Awareness Month* in April.

\$18,812 was actually spent in the spring to support a statewide 811 awareness campaign (Cable TV and web presence) and local community events and promotional items.

Additionally, the other half of this amount was available during the fall of 2009 to support the DPCs with local public awareness and stakeholder education events.

\$21,188 was actually spent in the fall to support both statewide 811 awareness campaigns (Cable TV and radio) and local community events and promotional items.

See Table-2 on Page-5 for a list of activities and associated costs at the county DPC level.

Table-3 on Page-8 lists the 811 Awareness activities, the stakeholder education programs, and the active compliance programs for each county down the page. The seven active (as of 2009) DPCs are listed across the top of the table. Under the name of each DPC is the list of counties within the service area of each DPC. The table indicates the different activities sponsored by each DPC. The two lines at the bottom of the table total the damage prevention activities and the compliance programs within the DPC service area. These seven DPCs support 811 Awareness and damage prevention activities in 19 of the 64 (30%) counties in Colorado. With the four new DPCs, 25 (39%) counties are supported.

**PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant  
Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001**

**Table-3**

Damage Prevention Council	Weld County	Denver Metro Area	El Paso County	Las Animas County	Mesa County	Four Corners Area	Western Slope
<b>COUNTIES SERVICED BY DPC</b>	Weld	Denver	EL Paso	Las Animas	Mesa	La Plata	Rio Blanco
		Adams				Montezuma	Garfield
		Jefferson				Ouray	Delta
		Arapahoe					Montrose
		Douglas					Moffat
		Broomfield					Mesa
<b>State Awareness Programs</b>							
State DP Proclamation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
County Commissioner Report Card	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mass Media Cable TV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNCC Excavator Handbook	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNCC Stakeholder Education	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNCC 811 Promo Items Color Code, Decals, Banners	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Local DP Education Programs</b>							
Industry Education							
Group Contractor Event	1			1		12	20
Group 1st Responder Event						12	20
Individual Contractor Meetings			3				
<b>Local 811 Public Awareness Events</b>							
County DP Proclamation				1			
Municipal DP Proclamation				1			
811 Mass Media Cable TV					1		1
811 Mass Media Radio				1	1		1
811 Mass Media Newspaper				1	1		
811 Community Parade	1	1					
811 Community Event/HomeShow		1		1		1	
811 Town Banner	1		1				
811 Gas Station Placards		1					
811 Yard/Park Signs	1		1	1	1		
811 Hardware Store Signs			1	1	1		
811 Public Postcards			1		1		
811 Decals(Auto/ToolBox)		1		1	1		
811 Promo Items		1		1	1	1	1
<b>Local Compliance Programs</b>							
Xcel Energy - Multiple Counties	X	X		X	X		X
Colo Springs Utility - 1 County			X				
Qwest Communications - Statewide	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Comcast Cable - Statewide	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Denver Metro DPC - In Discussion		?					
<b>Local DP Activities Count</b>							
<b>DP Compliance Programs</b>	4	5	7	10	8	26	43
	3	4	3	3	3	2	3

**Work Scope:** This objective supports Work Scope Elements 2 and 5.

**Future Activity:** Continue to meet and work with 11 DPCs.  
Continue to discuss forming additional DPCs with interested stakeholders.

**Expected Completion:** Objective met and complete in summer, 2009  
Additional activity complete in December, 2009



## PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001

### **Objective-9) Continue development of the Colorado Damage Prevention Portal.**

The construction of the Damage Prevention Portal has overcome many development obstacles over 2008 and 2009. The original objective was to build a web site that could be shared by all the DPCs and would include the following functionality:

- 1) Provide access to annual incoming ticket and damage data at the state and county level
- 2) Provide access to the DP Report Card document
- 3) Provide a method of scheduling DP activities, notifying stakeholders and tracking activity attendance
- 4) Provide access to relevant documents such as agendas, meeting minutes, documents, pictures, reports, etc.

After the initial start of development, the system developers suggested that the format be changed from a shared web site to a community portal. This required the development of a number of portal tools that would provide this functionality. In 2009, the developers identified and secured a viable open-source product ( [www.Liferay.com](http://www.Liferay.com) ) that included an underlying framework that supported the portal/community functionality they felt would serve the stakeholders best. In addition, they decided this framework should be integrated with CGA VP-DIRT to utilize existing user registration and provide “*single sign-on*” access to both platforms – as access to DIRT was needed to acquire damage data for the DP Report Card.

As of the end of 2009, the underlying portal framework is in place and provides some of the desired functionality – such as: “single sign-on”, blog posting, logo/picture, calendar access and posting. There is still much work needed to provide the original set as well as additional requirements and this work is quickly progressing.

Several DPCs are in the process of configuring the portal to customize the “*look and feel*” and to provide blog access to their membership. The developers have agreed to incorporate and complete the following modules during 2010:

- A) Provide access to a summary data table and historical chart of monthly incoming tickets, excavator notified damages, 2<sup>nd</sup> notices and emergency tickets by county.
  - o this information is provided via the Norfield Ticket system as staged data for the portal
- B) Provide access to the annual DP Report Card document and a copy of the DP Report Card by county.
  - o this information is provided via the Norfield Ticket system, VP-DIRT, and the US Census
  - o the information includes the final grades, tickets, damages and demographics by county
- C) Provide a mechanism to schedule, post, notify, track, and report on DP Activities.
  - o members of each stakeholder community will be notified of all scheduled events
  - o the DPC will post relevant follow up activity to each event (i.e. attendance, cost)
  - o the DP Activity report is required to incorporate a grading section on the DP Report Card
- D) Provide a mechanism to submit, track and report on the DP Compliance process.
  - o process includes submitting relevant information about a non-compliant stakeholder, emailing a letter to the stakeholder, and tracking all follow up activities for the compliance event

Stakeholders are anxiously awaiting the rollout of the portal and anticipate it will be a useful communications and data reporting tool when it is complete in 2010.

**Work Scope:** This objective supports Work Scope Elements 2 and 8.

**Future Activity:** Continue development of the DP Portal including:  
DP Report Card  
DP Activity  
DP Compliance

**Expected Completion:** **Objective Not Complete** - Additional work is required to complete the DP Portal in 2010.

## PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001

### **Quantifiable Metrics/Measures of Effectiveness (Item 2 under Section 9.01 Project Report: “Where the output of the project can be quantified, a computation of the cost per unit of output.”)**

*[This may be difficult to explain for every grant project, but we’re trying to get a sense of how effective this grant work has been in improving your damage prevention program. If your grant is more data oriented, you likely had some sort of metrics in mind to improve upon. If so, what were those metrics and how does the data look now compared to when the program started? If you’re doing something along the lines of enforcement that involves incident review, how many cases have you been able to review/close and/or fines collected compared to before the grant work? If you are working on something more along the lines of public awareness, how many stakeholders have you been able to reach? Even if you don’t have the metrics fully defined, put whatever you can here.]*

As stated in the *Overview* section on Page-2, the 2008 One-Call and facility damage data was reviewed and Quantifiable Metrics of Effectiveness were established and discussed using the relevant data in the 2009 Mid Term Report. The 2009 Damage Data Report and 2009 DP Report Cards should be available in July 2010. Since we do not have any new information to report on 2008 or 2009, we will discuss the 2009 facility damage data and Quantifiable Metrics of Effectiveness in the 2010 Mid Term Report. This delay is due to the timing difference between the grant report and the damage data report. Please see the 2009 Mid Term Report for the detail.

We will provide a brief review of the important findings from the 2009 Mid Term Report and the 2008 damage data.

We have established a *Damage-Prevention Metric*® using the ratio of (number of damages) over (number of incoming tickets/1,000). When both the number of damages and tickets are decreasing over time, this metric, or ratio, will also decrease if the number of damages decreases at a faster rate than the number of tickets. This is in fact what has happened in Colorado since 2003 as Table-4 below shows. The general trend has occurred for both all-facility damages and for natural gas-only facility damages.

Note though the small increase in the all-facility ratio from 2005 to 2006. This was caused by the larger increase in the natural gas-only ratio in 2006. The increase in natural gas damages in 2006 is most likely attributable to an increase in DIRT reporting from natural gas facility owners due to RP1162.

Table-4	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Incoming Tickets (reported for state)	750,994	752,161	748,817	706,168	634,630	547,732
All Damages	13,540	10,573	9,371	8,947	6,358	4,900
All Facility Ratio	18.03	14.06	12.51	12.67	10.02	8.95
Rate of Change		-22.03%	-10.97%	1.24%	-20.93%	-10.70%
Nat-Gas Damages	4,490	2,627	2,435	2,939	2,185	1,521
Nat-Gas Ratio	5.98	3.49	3.25	4.16	3.44	2.78
Rate of Change		-41.58%	-6.89%	27.99%	-17.27%	-19.35%

The decrease in the *Damage-Prevention Metric*® can be interpreted as an improvement in damage prevention. It is necessary, as damage prevention professionals, to question what has caused this improvement in damage prevention. There are a number of causes we can identify:

- It is interesting to note that the all-facility ratio had increased from 13 in 2001 to 18 in 2003, before starting its downward trend through 2008.
- Since 2007, the economy has slowed tremendously, causing locate requests and damages to also decrease. This does not necessarily mean that the ratio should decrease.
- Residential construction activity (permits) has also slowed tremendously in Colorado; decreasing 59% from the high in 2004. Again, a decrease in construction activity does not necessarily mean that the ratio should decrease.

## PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001

- In 2001, UNCC implemented the predecessor to CGA DIRT after the state legislature enacted a law to collect and report on facility damages. UNCC began collecting all-facility damage data and published the first Colorado Damage Report in 2002 for 2001 damage data. By 2004, the *Damage-Prevention Metric®* began decreasing. The data certainly supports the assertion that collecting and reporting on damage data, and increasing the stakeholder awareness of damage information and root causes, positively impacts the habits and attitudes of industry stakeholders. Based upon the experience in Colorado, we encourage the adoption of state legislation to collect and report on all facility damages as a means of both understanding the root causes and reducing the occurrence of damages. It will also allow damage prevention programs around the country to be evaluated and analyzed for effectiveness.
- With the assistance of PHMSA grant funding in 2008, the active participation by industry stakeholders has increased significantly. This is evidenced by the increase in the number of damage prevention councils in Colorado from 5 in 2007 to 11 in 2009 (and 13 in early 2010). The active participation by these dedicated stakeholders around the state resulted in the large increase in damage prevention awareness and stakeholder education activities as evidenced by Table-3 on Page-7. Damage prevention professionals throughout the state are thankful for the tremendous support and financial assistance PHMSA has provided in 2008 and 2009. Without this support, these activities would not have occurred.
- With the assistance of the PHMSA grant, we established the statewide *Damage Prevention Action Team*. This team of dedicated damage prevention professionals has been instrumental in leading the way and in improving damage prevention in Colorado. They have rallied stakeholder and organization support for creative and unique public awareness and educational activities in their local DPCs and counties. These stakeholders are the real shakers and movers. Without this team, there would be only a lot of discussion and not a lot of action.
- The enactment of RP1162 for the pipeline industry has positively impacted damage prevention also. It has especially helped increase public awareness and stakeholder education through the operator funding of many activities in select areas of the state. But it has also had a broader impact as the public awareness and stakeholder knowledge carry over to locating and excavating for the other facility types.

It should be clear that the *Damage-Prevention Metric®* decreased for all these reasons.

In the 2009 Mid Term Report we also established a *Damage-Prevention Cost Metric®* for 2008. This metric uses the ratio of (dollars spent for damage prevention related activities in a year) over the (actual decrease in damages in a year). The related costs included the UNCC Public Relations Administrator, the cost of producing the Annual Damage Data Report, the UNCC public relations budget, and the PHMSA 2008 grant. These costs totaled \$221,257, but they are not inclusive of all costs associated with damage prevention awareness and education in the state. There were also 1,458 fewer damages in 2008. The *Damage-Prevention Cost Metric®* for 2008 was 152, or 152 dollars per damage to reduce the number of damages. Unfortunately, we do not have a similar metric with which to compare our results from other states.

We hope that PHMSA finds our ticket and damage data, as well as the two derived metrics, useful in evaluating the effectiveness of the grant.

## PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001

### **Issues, Problems or Challenges (Item 3 under Section 9.01 Project Report: “The reasons for slippage if established objectives were not met. “)**

*[If the project has successfully concluded on schedule, simply state that there are no issues, problems or challenge to report. If there have been delays for any reason, explain what they are and how they have impacted the grant work. For instance, with some States, even after an agreement is in place, it has to be sent back to the Governor’s office for approval, which takes more time than originally anticipated. Even if work began immediately after the agreement was in place, other delays could have been caused by personnel changes or issues that arose as the project progressed. ]*

The DP Portal software is presently under development having recently adopted and migrated to the Liferay Portal Framework ([www.liferay.com](http://www.liferay.com)). The decision to adopt the Liferay framework and reconstruct came about with much consternation taking into account the delay in the expected deliverable to the stakeholder community. This is a very large and difficult undertaking for the development team of Table Mountain Partners, but they delivered a preliminary beta version of the DP Portal by year-end 2009. Additional functionality, such as the DP Activity process, DP Compliance process, and DP Report Card will be added in 2010.

The new web portal infrastructure will provide integration and personalization to the many stakeholder communities; utilizing existing Common Ground Alliance technologies such as single sign-on (SSO) and integrating directly into Virtual Private DIRT. This new direction will better serve the current Colorado damage prevention community.

A portal is a web-based application that is a gateway to users, providing a range of various high-level services. This application will bring damage prevention stakeholders to a single location allowing for planning and communication activities without the necessity of meeting in person to exchange information. This will also permit progress reports to be shared across geographic boundaries. Samplings of services that portal frameworks provide are those found on social networking sites, such as Facebook, Twitter and Igoogle. The DP Portal will include the capability for stakeholders to share email and documents; review the DP Report Card; report, contact and track stakeholders with Compliance issues; and report and track DP Activities conducted by the DPCs. The portal will also provide learning opportunities and heighten 811 awareness and damage prevention efforts.

All other objectives were met and completed as scheduled and without issue.

### **Final Financial Status Report**

*[Per the instructions in Section 9.04 of your agreement (included below), the financial status report should go to the Agreement Administrator (AA). For this section of the progress report, simply state “The final financial report has been sent as a separate attachment to the AA.”. However, if there are any issues with the Financial Status Report or additional explanation is needed, please provide that information here. If there are any delays for whatever reasons, these should be communicated to the AA and AOTR in advance.*

*From Section 9.04 of your agreement: “At the end of the grant period, the Grantee must submit a Final Financial Status Report, Standard Form 269 (SF-269), to report the status of all funds. In addition to SF-269, the Grantee should provide the break down of costs for each object class category (Personnel, Fringe Benefits, Travel, Equipment, Supplies, Contractual, Other, and Indirect Charges). This report must be submitted to the AA in electronic form via e-mail no later than [refer to your agreement for date.”]*

The final financial report has been sent as a separate attachment to the AA.

**PHMSA 2009 State Damage Prevention Program Grant  
Final Report – FO#: DTPH56-09-SN-0001**

**Requests of the AOTR and/or PHMSA**

*[In most cases, any questions or actions requested of the AOTR and PHMSA (such as grant modifications in anyway) should have been addressed in advance of filing the report. If this is the case, simply state “No actions requested at this time” or explain any actions that are currently in process. However, if something has come up recently, or if you haven’t been able to discuss with the AOTR yet, please describe here. ]*

**There were no questions or actions requested at this time.**

**Section 9.01**

*[Submit to AOTR and AA in electronic form via email by March 31, 2010.]*